C

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,585	06/18/2001	James H. Jen	MICR0246	1233

27792   7590   03/10/2006

RONALD M. ANDERSON
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 December 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims **1-32** are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on December 09, 2005 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

3.   Applicant argues that Hayes does not teach or suggest the feature

of receiving personal information from a user. In response to applicant's

argument examiner asserts that Hayes does teach the step of receiving personal

information from a user as shown in col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 30, col. 6, lines

57-col. 8, lines 5, col. 19, lines 18-26, col. 9, lines 6-12, col. 14, lines 7-43 [*the*

server receives user's modified profile (i.e., which includes user's identifier, user

context information that includes user ID and the user) from the user].

4.   Applicant argues that Hayes does not teach or suggest the feature

of storing multiple user records with personal information that corresponds to a

plurality of unique user identifies. In response to applicant's argument, the

examiner asserts that Hayes does teach storing multiple user records with

personal information that corresponds to a plurality of unique user identifies as

shown in col. 9, lines 6-12, col. 14, lines 7-67, col. 14, lines 7-43, col. 15, lines

24-36 [*storing user's profiles and preferences including user context information*

that includes user's identifier and the user in database 212].

5.   Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or

suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, and 17.

Claims 2-16 and 18-32 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action below.

6.   Applicants still have failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a patentable distinction over cited prior arts. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-32 are rejected below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Hayes, Jr.**, U.S. Patent No. **6,339,826**, in view of **Gupta et al.** (hereinafter Gupta) U.S. Patent No. **6,868,448**.

9.   As to claim 1, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for utilizing personal information to customize an application program, comprising the steps of:

receiving personal information from a user corresponding to a unique user identity, wherein the personal information includes at least one of the user's:

surname; given name; address; set of initials; telephone number; and firm name

(col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 30, col. 6, lines 57-col. 8, lines 5, col. 19, lines 18-26

–*the server receives user's modified profile from the user*);

creating a user record for each unique user identity including the personal

information (col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 4, col. 6, lines 57-col. 8, lines 5, col. 14,

lines 7-49 –*user's profile and preferences are generated and stored in database

212*);

storing multiple user records with personal information that corresponds to

a plurality of unique user identifies (col. 9, lines 6-12, col. 14, lines 7-67, col. 15,

lines 24-36 –*storing user's profiles and preferences including user name (ID) and

password in database 212*); and

upon identifying the unique user identity applicable to execution of an

application program that is included in the plurality of application programs,

sharing the personal information corresponding with the unique user identity with

the application program, wherein the personal information is applied to customize

an output of the application program (abstract, col. 7, line 54-col. 8, line 5, col.

11, line 66-col. 12, lines 67, col. 13, line 1-col. 14, line 67, col. 15, lines 37-58 –

*upon receiving request from user, server provides a list of software to which user

has permitted to access corresponding to user's preferences*).

However, Hayes, Jr. does not explicitly teach the feature of each of the

user records being accessible by plurality of application programs.

Gupta teaches the feature of login, client's profiles or profile services can

be shared/accessed by multiple applications (col. 7, lines 6-18, col. 12, line 48-

col. 13, line 14, col. 18, lines 22-46). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Gupta into the system of Hayes, Jr. to include the

feature of client's profile/profile service (i.e., user record) being accessible or

shared by multiple applications because it would have provided an efficient

system to allow accessing resources from local server without using signed

applets and allow applets to share services in the network.

10.   As to claim 2, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, further

comprising the steps of:

in response to receiving new personal information corresponding to the

unique user identity, retrieving the user record including the personal information

(col. 12, lines 33-59, col. 17, lines 65-col. 18, lines 30);

modifying the user record including the personal information with the new

personal information (col. 12, lines 33-59, col. 14, lines 7-67); and

sharing the new personal information with the application program,

wherein the new personal information is applied to an output of the application

program (abstract, col. 14, lines 4-67, col. 15, lines 37-58).

11.   As to claim 3, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, further

comprising the steps of :

in response to receiving new personal information corresponding to a new

unique user identity, creating a user record including the new personal

information corresponding to the new unique user identity (col. 7, lines 54-col. 8,

lines 5, col. 14, lines 7-col. 15, lines 36); and

sharing the new personal information corresponding to the new unique

user identity with the application program, wherein the new personal information

corresponding to the new unique user identity is applied to an output of the

application program (abstract, col. 14, lines 4-67, col. 15, lines 37-58).

12.   As to claim 4, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, further

comprising the steps of :

in response to receiving a change in user identity, retrieving the user

record corresponding to the changed user identity (col. 7, lines 54-col. 8, lines 5,

col. 14, lines 7-col. 15, lines 36); and

sharing personal information associated with the user record

corresponding to the changed user identity with the application program, wherein

the personal information associated with the user record corresponding to the

changed user identity is applied to an output of the application program (abstract,

col. 14, lines 4-67, col. 15, lines 37-58).

13.   As to claim 5, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, further

comprising the step of storing the user record in a framework identity database

(figure 2).

14.   As to claim 7, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, wherein

the step of receiving personal information corresponding to a unique user identity

further comprises receiving the personal information through a user interface

(figure 2).

15.   As to claim 8, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, wherein

the step of receiving personal information corresponding to a unique user identity

further comprises the step of receiving one of new and previously stored

personal information from one of a computer and a network (col. 7, lines 54-col.

8, lines 5, col. 14, lines 7-col. 15, lines 36).

16.   As to claim 9, Hayes. Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, wherein

the step of sharing the personal information with the application program further

comprises the step of customizing an output of the application program using the

personal information (abstract, col. 14, lines 4-67, col. 15, lines 37-58).

17.   As to claim 10, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the user interface comprises at least one of: a graphical user interface, a

mouse, a keyboard, a touch-sensitive display screen, voice recognition interface

(figures 1-2).

18.   As to claim 11, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the personal information comprises at least one of: a user name, an

address, a telephone number, a picture, a speech pattern, a preference, and a

list (col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 4, col. 14, lines 50-67).

19.   As to claim 12, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the personal information comprises at least one of: a dictionary, an auto-

correct list, a menu option, dialog layout, a dictionary setting, a grammar setting,

a help list, and a user preference list (figures 12-24).

20.   As to claim 13, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the output comprises at least one of: a document, a template, a wizard,

a command, a tab, a preference, and a feature (figures 12-24).

21.   As to claim 15, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the application program comprises a plurality of application modules

(col. 9, lines 5-12).

22.   As to claim 16, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

wherein the step of receiving personal information comprises the step of

receiving personal information from a second application program (col. 7, lines

54-col. 8, lines 5, col. 14, lines 7-col. 15, lines 36).

23.   As to claim 17, Hayes, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed,

including a computer system for utilizing personal information to customize an

application program comprising:

a memory for storing an application program, machine instructions, and a

framework identity database (figure 2 –*database 212*); and

a processor functionally coupled to the memory for executing the machine

instructions and response thereto, being operable for: receiving personal

information from a user corresponding to a unique user identity, wherein the

personal information includes at least one of the user's" surname; given name;

address; set of initials; telephone number; and firm name (col. 1, lines 56-col. 2,

lines 30, col. 6, lines 57-col. 8, lines 5 - *the server receives user's modified profile

from the user*);

creating a user record for each unique user identity including the personal

information (col. 1, lines 56-col. 2, lines 4, col. 6, lines 57-col. 8, lines 5 –*user's

profile and preferences are generated and stored in database 212*);

storing multiple user records with personal information that corresponds to

a plurality of unique user identities (col. 9, lines 6-12, col. 14, lines 7-67, col. 15,

lines 24-36 - *storing user's profiles and preferences including user name (ID) and

password in database 212*); and

upon identifying the unique user identity applicable to execution of an

application program included in the plurality of application programs, sharing the

personal information corresponding with the unique user identity with the

application program, wherein the personal information is applied to customize an

output of the application program (abstract, col. 14, lines 4-67, col. 15, lines 37-

58 -*upon receiving request from user, server provides a list of software to which*

user has permitted to access corresponding to user's preferences).

However, Hayes, Jr. does not explicitly teach the feature of each of the

user records being accessible by plurality of application programs.

Gupta teaches the feature of login, client's profiles or profile services can

be shared/accessed by multiple applications (col. 7, lines 6-18, col. 12, line 48-

col. 13, line 14, col. 18, lines 22-46). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to

incorporate the teaching of Gupta into the system of Hayes, Jr. to include the

feature of client's profile/profile service (i.e., user record) being accessible or

shared by multiple applications because it would have provided an efficient

system to allow accessing resources from local server without using signed

applets and allow applets to share services in the network.

24.   As to claim 18-21, 23-29, and 31-32, they are system claims

directed for utilizing personal information to customize an application program of

method claims 2-5, 7-13 and 15-16. Claims 18-21, 23-29, and 31-32 have

similar limitations to claims 2-5, 7-13 and 15-16; therefore, they are rejected

under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

26.   Claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

as being unpatentable over **Hayes, Jr.**, in view of **Alfred et al.** (hereinafter

Alfred) U.S. Publication No. **2003/0120496**.

27.   As to claim 6, Hayes, Jr. does not explicitly teach the invention as

claimed; however, Alfred teaches wherein the step of receiving personal

information further comprises, sending the personal information to a shared code

library for one or more application programs, wherein the shared code library

sends the personal information to the framework identity database (paragraphs

0016, 0018, 0024-0025). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Hayes, Jr. and Alfred to have sending the personal information to a

shared code library wherein the shared code library sends the personal

information to the framework identity database because it would have an efficient

communications system that can store the user profile in the memory and based

on that user profile to permit and/or provide user access application programs.

28.   As to claim 14, Hayes, Jr. does not explicitly teach the invention as

claimed; however, Alfred teaches wherein the application program comprises at

least one of the following group: word processor, an electronic spreadsheet, a

graphical presentation program, an electronic personal information manager, or

an electronic mail program (paragraph 0016). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made

to combine the teachings of Hayes, Jr. and Alfred to have the same motivation as

set forth in claim 6, supra.

29.   As to claim 22 and 30, they are system claims directed for utilizing

personal information to customize an application program of method claims 6

and 14. Claims 22 and 30 have similar limitations to claims 6 and 14; therefore,

they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

30.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the

extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

31.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Najjar Saleh, can be reached at (571) 272-4006.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Thu Ha Nguyen

February 24, 2006